

PROJECT TITLE : Tobacco Analysis
PERIOD COVERED : January 3rd - January 31st
WRITTEN BY : L. Joseph
APPROVED BY : F. Lopes

TOBACCO LOT ANALYSIS

1. Special trials

- FC Yugoslavian tobacco

Sixteen samples of the mentioned tobacco were received this month. The grades, reaping and ways of irrigation of these samples are different. The results were sent to Mr. Faber. (1)

- Partially contaminated lot (No. 9084) (2)

We have received a monitor and two samples more or less contaminated. Cigarettes were made for conventional TLA analyses and for special research investigations.

2. Routine tobacco lot analyses

- Introduction of inputs on EDP

Part of the analytical results of 13 lots was entered in the Analytical Data List.

- Lots under evaluation

Thirty.

- Lots available but not yet analysed

Eleven lots of local tobacco.

ASSISTANCE TO OTHER PROJECTS

1. RCB Monique

Trial NINO No. 2

The results of the smoke analyses are available. The CO, NO and puff number analyses were not done because of bad combustibility.

0000143760

The main difference between this and the usual RCB trials is the lower DPM delivery (12.9 mg/g instead of 18.9 mg/g).

Trial NINO No. 3 (unwashed stems)

The main differences in comparison to the usual RCB are: higher N-NO₃ level; consequently, more NO delivery, lower TA level and lower SN delivery.

Trial NINO/RCB No.5 (washed stems and denitrated extract without biomass) and the analyses of lot 0111 (48% dust) are under evaluation.

Concerning trial NINO/RCB No.4 (washed stems and denitrated extract with biomass) the quality and quantity of the samples are not good enough to make TLA analyses.

MISCELLANEOUS

A study was made on MLF components (Burley, FC, Orient, Reconstituted Tobacco and Esther). Single components were treated with pre and after-cutting MLF solutions according to standard recipes. TLA analyses were carried out on each component as well as on the blend obtained by mixing the components in the proportions of the MLF blend. The results were compared with those obtained with standard MLF blend.

As a first conclusion we can say that the results obtained on the mixed blend correspond to the values calculated with the individual results of each component (weighted proportions in the blend). Unfortunately, due to the non-homogeneity of the FC sample, we cannot compare the mixed blend values with those of the standard MLF blend. (See enclosed table).

L. Joseph

References:

- 1) Letter from L. Joseph to Mr. H. Faber, dd. February 5th, 1980
- 2) Letter from Mr. Lecoultre to Miss L. Joseph, dd. December 17th, 1980

00000143761

F I L L E R

	<u>BUR</u>	<u>FC</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>TR</u>	<u>ES</u>	<u>MEL.</u> <u>SC</u>	<u>MEL.</u> <u>CALC.</u>	<u>PART</u> <u>MLF</u>
ALKALOIDS, TOTAL %	1.56	1.24	1.06	0.67	0.63	1.19	1.14	1.83
RED. SUGARS %	1.7	15.6	14.0	3.9	6.5	8.9	8.5	7.5
NITRATE, N. %	0.42	0.01	0.02	0.27	0.72	0.31	0.23	0.29
AMMONIA N. %	0.44	0.20	0.11	0.90	0.29	0.36	0.40	0.34
PH TOBACCO %	6.1	5.5	5.5	6.5	5.4	5.9	5.9	5.9
MOIST. EQUIL. %	12.2	13.7	13.9	13.2	12.0	12.1	13.1	13.1
FILL. POWER CV. ML/10G	40.2	24.0	24.0	32.0	48.9	34.5		34.1
FILL. POWER CORRIG. 12% ML/10G	40.9	29.6	30.3	36.0	48.9	34.8	35.4	37.6

F I L T E R

	<u>BUR</u>	<u>FC</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>TR</u>	<u>ES</u>	<u>MEL.</u> <u>SC</u>	<u>MEL.</u> <u>CALC.</u>	<u>PART</u> <u>MLF</u>
SN (MG/G)	1.39	0.91	0.77	0.58	0.34	1.01	0.91	1.28
HCH (MG/G)	117	68	46	60	42	82	75	79
ALDEH. (MG/G)	0.74	1.00	0.90	0.58	0.88	0.91	0.82	0.85

S M O K E

D P M (MG/G)	23.5	29.8	29.1	18.0	8.8	25.4	24.0	26.9
SN (MG/G)	1.59	1.40	1.23	0.68	0.32	1.20	1.20	1.84
PUFF COUNT/G	11.6	15.0	15.2	10.1	8.0	12.2	12.6	12.1
HCH (MG/G)	345	289	280	392	209	414	318	366
ALDEH. (MG/G)	1.83	2.05	1.92	1.59	1.88	2.18	1.87	2.07
CO (MG/G)	25.9	19.9	20.0	26.6	22.3	27.8	23.1	25.9
NO (MG/G)	0.73	0.07	0.11	0.44	0.51	0.45	0.36	0.41

0000143762